DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 994 SP 041 062

AUTHOR	Morine-Dershimer, Greta, Ed.; Huffman-Joley, Gail, Ed.
TITLE	Dispelling Myths about Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, DC.
ISBN	ISBN-0-89333-176-7
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	70p.
AVAILABLE FROM	AACTE Publications, 1307 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 300, Washington, DC 20005-4701 (AACTE members $15.95; nonmembers $20.95). Tel: 202-293-2450; Fax: 202-457-8095; Web site: http://www.aacte.org.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020) -- Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Deans; Academic Standards; Administrator Role; Beginning Teachers; Educational Change; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Fund Raising; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; Student Teachers; Teacher Competencies; Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	Public Awareness

ABSTRACT

This collection of papers presents the experiences of several university educators in dispelling myths about teacher education. The papers include: "Introduction--Out of the Ivory Towers: Making Connections with the Public" (Gail Huffman-Joley); "Education Deans Are Not Activists for Reform" (Richard C. Kunkel and Molly Hultquist Gregg); "There Is No Connection between Standards and the Assessment of Beginning Teachers" (E. Lynne Weisenbach); "Teacher Education Programs Are All the Same" (Mary E. Diez); "Teacher Education Is Not Reality Based" (Raphael O. Nystrand); "We Have 'Lost' the Best and Brightest in Teacher Education" (Frank B. Murray); "Schools and Colleges of Education Are Unable To Raise Funds" (Bernard Oliver); and "Outsiders Are Not Welcome" (Gary Galluzzo). (Papers contain references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 468 994

DISPELLING MYTHS About TEACHER EDUCATION

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Imig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Greta Morine-Dershimer & Gail Huffman-Joley
Editors

AACTE

SP041062

DISPELLING MYTHS About TEACHER EDUCATION

Greta Morine-Dershimer & Gail Huffman-Joley
Editors

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is a national, voluntary association of colleges and universities with undergraduate or graduate programs to prepare professional educators. The Association supports programs in data gathering, equity, leadership development, networking policy analysis, professional issues, and scholarship.

The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this monograph do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The AACTE does not endorse or warrant this information. The AACTE is publishing this document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation among educators. The reader must evaluate this information in light of the unique circumstances of any particular situation and must determine independently the applicability of this information thereto.

Excerpt from "At U of L: Teaching life-long learners" by D. Hawpe reprinted from The Courier-Journal, Louisville, Kentucky. Copyright 1997 by The Courier-Journal.

Dispelling Myths About Teacher Education may be ordered from:

AACTE

AACTE Publications
1307 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-4701
Tel: 202/293-2450
Fax: 202/457-8095
Web site: www.aacte.org

Single copy: $15.95 AACTE members
$20.95 nonmembers

Copyright © 2000 by American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America.

ISBN No: 0-89333-176-7

This book is dedicated to
Raphael "Ray" O. Nystrand (1931-1999)
whose commitment to education continues to be an inspiration.

CONTENTS

Foreword 7

Introduction 11

Myth 1: Education Deans Are Not Activists for Reform 15

Myth 2: There Is No Connection Between Standards and the Assessment of Beginning Teachers 25

Myth 3: Teacher Education Programs Are All the Same 33

Myth 4: Teacher Education Is Not Reality Based 39

Myth 5: We Have "Lost" the Best and Brightest in Teacher Education 45

Myth 6: Schools and Colleges of Education Are Unable to Raise Funds 55

Myth 7: Outsiders Are Not Welcome 63

About the Editors 71

About the Authors 73

FOREWORD

In this time of widespread concern about the quality of public schools, teacher shortages, and international comparisons, one of the most logical fields to target for change and for blame is teacher education. Common sense makes a clear connection between the quality of teachers and student success. In one direction, we can extend the line of dots from schools to teaching to student learning with a focus on the quality of teacher education. Extending the line of dots in the other direction places the "problem" in the laps of policy makers. If you add the contemporary ways of addressing problems through the use of attack politics, 18-second sound bytes, and mandating short-term fixes, it is easy to understand how deans and directors of teacher education find themselves on the receiving end of criticisms and proposals for change. Additionally, teacher education leaders regularly find themselves in the position of needing to argue against simplistic labels and false stereotypes.

A primary role of the Research and Information (R & I) Committee co-sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) is addressing the issue of how to help deans and directors of teacher education respond to questions with data, research findings, and facts. During each meeting of the R & I committee over the last several years, in one form or another, the issue of the need for deans and directors to respond quickly to questions from the media, policy makers, and university administrators has been a topic of dialogue. The discussions on this topic often were stimulated by urgent requests from the members of the AACTE Board of Directors, or the president of AACTE for information that would help them respond to a pressing question. NCATE leaders also would

request research information on an issue that they were hearing about from members. Occasionally, a request for help would come directly from a dean or director.

As researchers are trained to do, we looked for patterns in the data. In this case, members of the Research and Information Committee began to observe a pattern, or theme, that cut across many of the urgent requests for data. In a large number of instances the requests were for data and research findings that dealt with a question that was not grounded in the realities of teacher education as we know it. Instead, the questions were based on stereotypes of teacher education that most of us within the profession know to be false. Still, the questions were asked by those who obviously thought that they were on target.

At first, the committee members discussed ways to best provide assistance to those in need. We would ask: what data are available and what already existent reports would help? In some instances, the committee initiated studies to obtain relevant data. For example, the committee initiated a national survey about the uses of technology in teacher education programs (Persichitte, Tharp, & Caffarell, 1997, Persichitte, Tharp, & Caffarell, in press). However, over the last several years as questions surfaced, members who had served on the committee for some time began to say, "Oh no, not that one again!" (The *pattern* returns.) Some of the stereotypes and misinformed questions were being repeated a second, or even a third time. Before long, committee members began to talk about these questions as "myths." In this case, myths are defined as those statements that are misleading and untrue, and in some cases simply innuendoes, about teacher education. They are hard to refute, but very easy for the misinformed and critics of the field to proclaim as truths. The committee members then began to discuss potential ways to respond to these myths. The first step was to identify the ones that were prevalent enough to be called "standard" or "typical" about teacher education. The list grew to about a dozen. The committee members also began to share anecdotes about deans and directors who had been effective in using data to refute each myth. The anecdotes were interesting and informative.

Next, the committee members recorded some effective tactics used to refute these myths. The primary ground rule was that data should be a key part of the responses. Experienced deans and researchers who were successful in this venture spoke at a session at the 1997 AACTE Annual Meeting. Their stories were well received and a second session was presented at the 1998 Annual Meeting. The Research and Information Committee then asked the presenters, or should we

call them "myth busters," to write a brief description of the myth they had dealt with and how they had responded using data and research findings. This volume is the result of those efforts.

This publication would not have come to fruition without the efforts of many people. Clearly, the authors presented here represent many of the hard working leaders of teacher education and their clear thinking while on the firing line. Without their effective efforts to lead teacher education, these myths would continue to go unchallenged. The members of the R & I Committee are to be commended for keeping this idea alive and pushing the project to fruition. Special thanks must be given to Greta Morine Dershimer who took on the lead editor responsibilities while engaged in many other professional tasks and personal responsibilities. We want to express our appreciation to Gail Huffman-Joley who has taken time away from her leadership tasks to co-edit and shepherd this manuscript into final production. The association staff leadership also has been a key in this endeavor. Without the advocacy of Mary Dilworth of AACTE and Donna Gollnick of NCATE this product would have died.

There is one other interest group that contributed heavily to this project that should be acknowledged—the critics of teacher education and those with limited knowledge about teacher education. Without their involvement, we would not have thought through these myths so carefully and been able to construct ways of using data and findings from research to inform and ultimately improve their understanding of what it takes to offer high-quality teacher education.

Gene E. Hall
Chair, AACTE/NCATE Research and Information Committee (1997-1999)
Dean, College of Education, University of Nevada-Las Vegas

References

Persichitte, K. A., Tharp, D. D., & Caffarell, E. P. (1997). The use of technology by schools, colleges, and departments of education, 1996. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 422268).

Persichitte, K. A., Tharp, D. D., & Caffarell, E. P. (in press). Technology integration in teacher preparation: A qualitative research study. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*.

INTRODUCTION

Out of the Ivory Towers: Making Connections With the Public

Gail Huffman-Joley

In this volume, deans of colleges and schools of education provide us real-life stories of their personal experiences in confronting persistent but untrue popular beliefs, or myths, about teacher education. Their stories, usually written in the first person, are eloquent and persuasive. Underscoring the powerful message of each essay is the belief that to dispel existing myths and prevent them from ever forming, education deans must make significant, on-going connections with the public. In his or her own way, these deans have connected with the schools and the public at large and in doing so, have come to better understand and address public perceptions and misconceptions.

Traditionally, education professors, following a model used in colleges of arts and sciences, were nurtured and rewarded for professional service and research narrowly linked to their field of study and expertise. University rewards of promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases usually were tied to research and service in a field of study honored and recognized by the academy, which often appeared to have little application for society at large. While other professional schools such as medicine, business, and law maintained close ties with their constituents in the field, schools and colleges of education de-emphasized that important practical aspect of their mission in the attempt to gain university status. As a result, many SCDEs lost touch with their primary constituents—educators in public schools. However, toward the end of the 1980s when criticism of public schools increased, the external pressure for schools of education to aid the public in addressing their concerns about education also increased.

Thus, with few predecessors to emulate, the education deans who tell their stories in this book forged new roles and relationships with

K-12 colleagues and others to address those public concerns about education. These deans often assumed roles outside of their university campuses, and the traditional associations and learned societies of their fields of expertise. All of them communicated regularly with external committees, legislatures, and the general public, rather than talking primarily among themselves and to other university colleagues as they traditionally had done. These deans learned to make the seemingly strange language of education and educational issues familiar to the press, state and community action groups, and the public. By leaving the "ivory tower" to make connections and build bridges with the public, these deans dispelled myths by providing accurate information and new ways of framing issues.

In the beginning essay in this volume, Kunkel and Gregg debunk the myth that education deans are not actively involved in efforts for broad educational reform, be it national, regional, state, or local. They provide snapshots of 10 activist deans of education whose reform efforts and accomplishments reflect the concerns and values of the public during the 1990s. The essay begins with the story of a former dean at Alabama, Truman Pierce, who provides a powerful and exceptional example of a pioneering predecessor who debated then-Governor George Wallace, arguing against discrimination in the schools. The authors then describe the leadership efforts of nine deans, who were engaged deeply in broad-based educational reform movements in the 90s.

Next, Weisenbach dispels the myth that schools of education still remain in the "ivory tower" and are unaware and unaffected by statewide efforts to implement and strengthen performance-based standards and assessments for teachers and for students in K-12 schools. Using Indiana as an example, Weisenbach describes the ongoing, significant involvement of teacher educators throughout the process. She provides strong evidence to discredit the myth that little connection exists between K-12 standards and a teacher's career continuum from preparation, through licensure, and certification. She also documents the integral involvement of all education stakeholders, including K-12 teachers, administrators, teacher educators, and policy makers, in determining what is really important for young students and those who teach them.

In the third essay, Diez addresses the myth that all teacher preparation programs are the same. Diez sees this as part of a larger attack focused on damning all institutions that prepare teachers. She contends that this attack not only argues that all teacher education programs are the same, but that they are all ineffective and therefore it suggests there is little hope for improvement. Diez counters this myth

by using the Alverno performance-based program and evidence gathered from school principals who hired Alverno graduates. Findings indicate that indeed there are differences in programs, and therefore, also differences in the skills of beginning teachers. Principals attest that Alverno students are better prepared to work effectively to nurture learning in diverse students. Diez reminds us that although all teacher education programs are not the same, all have a moral responsibility to prepare teachers for the real world that exists in today's schools.

Nystrand's story, the fourth essay, debunks the myth that teacher preparation programs are not reality-based and that teacher education is out of touch. Teacher educators, Nystrand argues, can best gain an understanding of school issues and problems by spending time in schools. Through the University of Louisville's Professional Development School (PDS) partnerships with schools in metropolitan Jefferson County and other districts, university faculty and students are assigned to each PDS. Because of Nystrand's first-hand experience with the school-based program, he was prepared when a reporter from the local newspaper, The Courier Journal, called for his reaction to Public Agenda's rather scathing indictment about how out of touch schools of education are with the real world. As a result, instead of blasting the school of education, the newspaper published a glowing article singing the praises of the university's real-world program for students preparing to be teachers.

In the next essay, Murray addresses the myth of the "lost" best and brightest students entering teacher preparation programs. Critics proclaim that the decline in schools, nearly always defined as a decline in SAT scores, are attributed to the quality of teachers and those preparing to be teachers. That argument leads to today's debate about the quality of education schools, namely, that the quality will never improve until the nation's top students enroll in teacher education programs. In responding to national and local critics that include elected officials, Murray developed three ways to demonstrate that the problem was more complex than it appeared and to show that help was on the way.

Do schools, colleges and departments of education pull their weight in fundraising efforts? Bernard Oliver's essay offers evidence that they do. He addresses the misconceptions about teacher educators' ability to be effective players in college and university capital campaigns using a successful campaign he participated in as an example. He points out that fundraising is a time consuming activity for administrators and faculty, but that the rewards are meaningful.

In the final essay by Gary Galluzzo, he examines the results of cloistering ourselves into a world we made more inaccessible to the general public than it should be. In the process of transforming teaching from an occupation to a profession, Galluzzo believes educators developed a language that would facilitate conversations with colleagues about teaching; however, as useful as it may be in advancing our thinking and scholarship, our lexicon does little to build a relationship of trust with people who see teaching as a rather simple task. Our remoteness, he argues, has allowed the general public to create myths about teaching, learning, and schooling. Galluzzo dispelled many of these myths by offering a weekly, five-minute commentary on a Colorado affiliate of National Public Radio. Each week he analyzed a topic of education that was in the newspapers, in the legislature, and of some significance to the general public using data. Examples of topics include test score declines and issues of school reform. While not suggesting educators give weekly commentaries, he seeks to persuade us to be more public about what we do—to explain why we do the things we do and to discuss the ethical questions that surround it all. Galluzzo argues that educators must be able to explain what we do in clear and precise terms so that we build confidence and trust with the public. "Educators are communicators and we should use our well-developed skills as communicators to build bridges between our jargon and our public," he says. "Informing the public should be a natural role for educators."

I hope that readers learn from the powerful examples of these deans who confronted some of the long-standing myths about education. I hope also that as deans and other educators continue to assume new roles and relationships, they will agree with Galluzzo—using clear language and explaining complex topics in ways people can readily understand, can go a long way to dispel existing myths and prevent them from forming.

MYTH 1

Education Deans Are Not Activists for Reform

Richard C. Kunkel and Molly Hultquist Gregg

There is an inaccurate belief across America that deans of Colleges of Education are not actively involved in educational reform at any governmental level, be it national, regional, state, or local. In fact, a long, powerful but often forgotten history of leadership exists.

In Alabama 20 years ago, one could have witnessed the profound effect of the leadership of Truman M. Pierce, dean of the School of Education at Auburn University. During his tenure, Pierce was known nationally as a crusader and pioneer. Among other things, he was active in debating Governor George Wallace over the dangers of having white and Negro schools in the South, arguing against discrimination in schools, and organizing legislative support for the improved training of teachers and school administrators. Pierce understood that "Innovations don't happen overnight. They have antecedents and they have consequence" (Opelika-Auburn News, August 24, 1975). In his book, *Imperatives of Lasting Public School Reform* (1987), published 12 years after his retirement as Auburn's Dean of Education, Pierce identified three imperatives or tasks that he believed needed to be accomplished if public schools were to live up to the role society ascribes to them: "(1) selecting and preparing highly competent professional persons for the schools, (2) creating and maintaining an environment that enables and encourages the professional to make a career in the classroom, and (3) developing and implementing a program of continuous school district evaluation" (p. 108).

These same beliefs are echoed throughout the stories in this chapter. As Pierce demonstrated through his leadership, deans of education can play a critical role in initiating and sustaining reform—contrary to reports like that of Deborah Wadsworth in *Different Drummers: How Teachers of Teachers View Public Education* (1997). This chapter dis-

pels the myth by telling the stories of 10 activist deans of education whose reform efforts and accomplishments reflect the concerns and values of the public. Drawn from their reform efforts within the last decade , the lessons they've learned are an important part of educational history that needs to be documented and shared.

Mary Futrell, dean of the Graduate School of Education and Human Development at George Washington University, Washington, D.C., who previously served as President of the National Education Association during the Reagan/Bush era, has built a national reputation as a spokesperson for teachers. Her support of teacher and school reform continues through her work with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Her determination and commitment to reform have led to unprecedented leadership for the Washington, DC area in linking university programs to national standards. Her experiences expand the entire range of political fronts as indicated by her service as former president of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession and her current role as president of Education International. She also serves as a senior consultant for Quality Education for Minorities Network, and is a board member of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Kettering Foundation, the Newspaper Association of America, the Institute for Educational Leadership, and as the chaird of the Board of Directors of the Holmes Partnership.

Gary Galuzzo, dean of the Graduate School of Education at George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia, has a history as a productive researcher and author on educational matters. Galuzzo clearly demonstrates the activist role a dean of education can play in reform. During his tenure as dean of education at the University of Northern Colorado-Greeley, he worked closely with the state's governor, Roy Romer, who spearheaded the "standards movement" for President Clinton. From 1992-1997, while Galuzzo served as co-chair of The Colorado Teacher and Special Services Professional Standards Board, the Board completely re-wrote the standards for initial and continuing licensing of teachers and other special service providers. Using the most current thinking and innovative research: coherent programs, performance assessment, reflective practice, PDS partner schools, and teacher-directed professional development, the Board successfully assured that all proven or successful practices were encoded in Colorado's regulations that guide the preparation of professional educators.

Fay B. Haisley, retired dean of the School of Education at the University of the Pacific, Stockton, California, has given much leadership to educational improvement at the local, state, and national levels. She is an outstanding example of a dean of education at a private university who has committed herself to the improvement of education for all children. Her accomplishments, while centered around teacher education programs, have touched educational reform at many levels through many organizations. Much of Haisley's influence within the state has resulted from her advocacy work for children at risk. Her efforts have included securing grants and funding for a variety of projects, including the Head Start Center at the University of the Pacific, statewide English as a Second Language activities, bilingual doctoral student issues, and special education programs.

Haisley was appointed to the Commission on Teacher Credentials in February of 1985 as a representative of private universities in California. In 1986, she was elected to the Board of Directors of the Far West Regional Laboratory as a representative for private universities and she was elected chair of this organization in 1995. She has also served an important role in the development and implementation of the bill (S. 1422) which addresses integrated programs of teacher preparation in order to effectively prepare future teachers in content and pedagogy.

Gail Huffman-Joley, recently retired dean (1990-1997) of the School of Education at Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana, stands as a strong example of the leadership initiative of a dean of education in this decade of reform. She served as the first chair of the respected Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB). The IPSB is acknowledged throughout the United States as a model for linking professional standards boards to many other agencies consistent with the recommendations of the report of the National Commission on Teaching for America's Future, What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future (1996). Through Huffman-Joley's leadership, the IPSB is linking Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) preparation standards to institutions for licensing and is linking the National Professional Standards Board standards to the continued professional development of teachers.

As an advisor to several governors of the state of Indiana as well as the Indiana superintendent of education, Huffman-Joley has been directly involved in setting the standards for K-12 public schools in the state and for addressing the issue of student assessment. While leading the state to a comprehensive vision of educational reform,

she has served on the board of directors for The Holmes Partnership and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. She was also named by Governor Evan Bayh to the National Governors Association Academy on Systemic Education Improvement and has worked directly with leadership in workforce development and child and family services with the Commissioner of Higher Education.

The leadership Huffman-Joley demonstrated throughout her career as dean clearly illustrates how an education dean can transcend the traditional role of higher education in educational reform, transcend party affiliation, and strengthen the images of teachers, professors, and policymakers. Many people in Indiana will tell you that it is hard to recognize which of these groups Huffman-Joley represents because her actions are in the best interests of all participants with a direct focus upon serving the needs of children.

Roderick McDavis, currently provost and vice president for Academic Affairs of Virginia Commonwealth University and previously dean of the College of Education at the University of Florida, Gainesville and at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, has been involved in reform efforts that resonate throughout both Florida and Arkansas. While in Arkansas, McDavis served as an advisor to then-Governor Bill Clinton on educational matters ranging from standards for teacher education programs to the development of teacher preparation programs. McDavis served on the "blue ribbon" commission which led Arkansas to become one of the first states to recognize the importance of national accreditation as state policy. He was also instrumental in influencing the Arkansas State Department of Education to rely on NCATE accreditation as an alternative to state program approval even though NCATE had not yet developed its state recognition program, created in 1984.

In Florida, McDavis assumed a leadership role in educational reform by supporting legislation designed to broaden the workforce pool of minority teachers. He played an active role on the Florida Professional Standards Board and became an advisor to the Florida Commissioner of Education and the Florida legislature. Outstanding leadership in educational matters was found in the office of the dean of the University of Florida. That leadership has resulted in changing the nature of the diversity pool of Florida's teacher education candidates and this is one of the most comprehensive and significant state reform initiatives impacted by a dean of a college of education.

Nicholas Michelli, dean of the College of Education and Human Services at Montclair State University, Montclair, New Jersey, has for years served as a community organizer and advocate for

projects and programs intended to improve education in New Jersey and surrounding states. During the years when New Jersey was pioneering alternative routes for certification, Michelli was viewed as a leader in developing approaches for the improvement of education. Many governors have relied on his advice and he regularly testifies before the U.S. Congress on matters of educational importance: professional development, the reauthorization of Chapter I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and Title V of the Higher Education Act.

Michelli has been an advocate for the postulates of John Goodlad outlined in his work, *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools* (1990). As a spokesperson for the support of many educational reform efforts, he has served on the education transition teams for New Jersey governors, participated in voter education and registration drives in Newark, and worked in the campaign for an independent candidate for county government in Suffolk County, New York. Michelli's service to the children of New Jersey and the surrounding region attest to his record of educational reform.

Ray Nystrand, former dean of the College of Education at the University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky, began his role in Kentucky school reform in 1984 when Governor Martha Layne Collins appointed him Secretary of the Education and Humanities Cabinet of the Commonwealth. At the time, Kentucky had an elected state superintendent so Nystrand did not serve as the chief state school officer but as advisor to the governor on educational policy. He also oversaw several state agencies. Governor Collins was the first Kentucky governor to make statewide educational reform a priority and she appointed a commission which Nystrand staffed, to develop legislative recommendations, many of which were enacted. During this time, the suit that ultimately led to the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 was filed. The court decision required the legislature to reconstitute the state's school system. To accomplish this task three out-of-state consultants were hired to make recommendations. Although Nystrand left the Governor's Commission and returned to the University of Louisville, he had the opportunity to advise the legislative staff about which consultants to hire, to speak with them about their proposals, and to help shape the legislative language regarding the part of the bill that dealt with alternative teacher certification. Subsequently, Nystrand aided the staff of the state Council on Higher Education in shaping a role for higher education in the support of statewide school reform which was set forth in a joint resolution of the legislature. Nystrand consistently spoke on behalf of

school reform and encouraged the University of Louisville to be supportive in numerous ways. In addition, he served as a member of the State Education Professional Standards Board.

Arturo Pacheco, dean of the College of Education at the University of Texas-El Paso, has been a leader in multicultural education in Texas and he has brought much attention to teacher education reform by serving as an advocate for the postulates of John Goodlad. At UTEP, as a site director for John Goodlad's national Network for Educational Renewal, Pacheco, in collaboration with his faculty and colleagues in a set of partnership schools, is leading an effort to completely restructure the College of Education into a clinical field-based model of educator preparation. Pacheco has developed numerous partnerships with local public schools to advance the status of educators in his local community and the state as a whole. He was appointed by the governor of Texas to the newly created State Board for Educator Certification.

David Smith, former dean of the College of Education at The University of Florida, Gainesville, is often referred to as "the dean of the state of Florida." Smith led a statewide study of school finance which now drives the funding formula for Florida's public schools. In addition, he created one of the nation's first five-year teacher education programs. Smith's leadership in the conceptualization and implementation of the University of Florida's "Pro Teach" program continues as a solid example of linking academically demanding programs in subject areas with clinical experience in "real schools."

Smith was often called upon to advise Governor Bob Graham on educational matters. He served as the first chair of the Florida Educational Standards Commission after being elected to the position by a teacher-dominated board. Under his guidance, the Commission became one of the most respected advisory groups to the Florida Governor and his staff. In retirement he has been called upon by the current Governor of the state and the state Education Commissioners' office to advise and assist with low-performing schools. Some of Smith's achievements include: reappointment to the Educational Standards Commission, State of Florida (1994); Board of Directors, Florida Council on Economic Education (1993); Award of Merit for Exemplary Service to the Economic Education by the Florida Council of Economic Education (1991); recognition award for Outstanding Service in Promoting Free Enterprise Education, Florida Council of Economic Education (1989); resolution of commendation by the Florida Cabinet for Leadership and Service to the State of Florida (1988); and Member, Governor's Professional Teacher Task Force, State of Florida (1985).

The last case study notes the work of **Jill Mattuck Tarule**, dean of the College of Education and Social Sciences at the University of Vermont, Burlington and recent Chair of the Board of Directors of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Tarule has worked in many Vermont communities to establish relationships and partnerships to garner support and services from various organizations and agencies in an effort to provide full service schools for children. Her work has done much to enhance programs providing health services to the state's children, especially children coming from impoverished backgrounds. In addition, she is a member of a number of committees that are planning ways to implement the Equal Education Opportunity Act passed in Vermont. She has testified before the Senate Education Committee on behalf of numerous committee proposals. Tarule completed five years of service on the Vermont Professional Standards Board and her record of leadership activities exemplifies the impact deans of education can have on policy development and implementation in many states.

After gathering these stories together, compiling the history of Truman Pierce in Alabama, gaining knowledge from each abstract reported in this chapter, and from the direct experiences of the authors, it seems appropriate to discuss learning and insights that can be derived. Often an activist or proactive dean may find themselves pondering several issues: time management, diversity of beliefs among faculty, changing nature of governmental authority and political affiliations, competing and balancing interests, and the patience to continue moving forward despite the fact we often have to take a few steps back. These issues are captured in the following questions and thoughts.

Where is the Dean?

The problems associated with being absent from the office is a permanent problem for activist deans, whether their reform agenda is directed at the national, regional, or state level. It appears that the time spent away from campus must be outweighed by the benefits to the college and those in higher education. Having a politically active dean must be understood and supported by the mission statement of the institution, the president, provost, administration, and faculty. Continuous accountability on the part of the dean can help with this perceived conflict of duty. A capable staff in the dean' office should be able to maintain office operations during absences. Thus said, the effective dean must be able to delegate responsibility in order to accomplish one of the most important tasks of leaders of our colleges—building relationships beyond the ivy-covered walls.

Faculty Disagreement with Reforms or Improvements

It appears that as the number of faculty involved in reform efforts grows, so does the opportunity for some to disagree with the direction of the dean's leadership. The more specific the reform activity becomes, the greater the opportunity for this disagreement. Examples of conflict in recent years include, but are not limited to, advancing whole language methodology vs. phonics, the emphasis on outcomes-based education, and forms of rewards and sanctions for schools. The task for the dean once again is to build relationships and to broaden the lens through which all of the players are looking to identify common themes, objectives, and goals.

Changes in State Leadership

As legislators and agency heads change it is always necessary for an activist dean to be willing to start from scratch to dispel myths and stereotypes about colleges of education and teacher education. Patience and willingness to continue the effort is tested continually. As education has become more and more a political platform for various state leaders, it is reasonable to expect that future leaders are elected on educational platforms that are different from their predecessors. This, in itself, could cause a dean active during one legislative term to find themselves on the opposing side of educational issues with incumbent leaders in the next term. Once again, it is the dean's task to identify the common concern—the importance of all children and their continued learning.

Advocating for K-12 and Teacher Preparation Improvement, Not All of Higher Education

As deans spend more time addressing state governments, it is only natural that they be seen by legislators and other lobbyists as reporting on the reform efforts of their own institution and higher education in general. There must be a clear understanding between the dean, the president of the institution, and those working regularly to advance higher education legislation that one of the objectives of the dean is to support their college, and the other is to support educational reform for education's sake. The dean must seek a balance between the two objectives that is reflective of our common concern for all children and their continued learning.

Earning Respect Takes Time

While in some ways the institution that a dean of education represents signifies a degree of respectability to a legislator or grassroots

organization, it takes time for relationships to build and for the ability to impact change to evolve. Patience to stay with an agenda and continue from legislature to legislature is trying as long-term impact on a system as large and complicated as education is not accomplished in one legislative session. Reform and improvement do not end.

Education Deans as Activists

Anecdotal information has its limits, but this does not discredit the work of these deans of education who defy the myth of non-involvement. Their work and commitment to the continuing education of all children should be celebrated and shared. These 10 men and women repudiate the myth and represent the reality: education deans are activists for reform.

References

Farkas, S. & Johnson, J. (with Duffett, A.). (1997). *Different drummers: How teachers of teachers view public education.* New York: Public Agenda.

Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future.* New York: Author.

Pierce recalls his half century in education. (1975, August 24). *The Opelika-Auburn News*, p. A-8.

Pierce, T. (1987). *Imperatives for lasting public school reform.* Auburn, AL: Truman Pierce Institute, Auburn University, Alabama.

MYTH 2

There Is No Connection Between Standards and the Assessment of Beginning Teachers

E. Lynne Weisenbach

Efforts to restructure schools and ensure accountability for P-12 student learning are redefining the notion of what it means to be a teacher. At the national level, President Clinton has called for higher school standards along with a program of national testing in reading and mathematics, while at the state level, standards and assessments throughout the P-12 experience are being implemented. Rather than merely offering courses, schools are often expected to demonstrate that their students learn and perform at high levels.

Many P-12 educators as well as legislators and policy makers perceive that teacher education has been unwilling or unable to respond and adapt to these developments. In other words, there is a myth that the "ivory tower" is totally unaware and unaffected by the standards and assessments movement within schools. Are we? Should we be? If so, in what ways?

There are a number of efforts currently underway to develop and implement meaningful standards for teachers linked to P-12 student standards and assessments. In recent years, several reports have stressed that teachers must embrace professional standards setting if teaching is going to meet the promise of being a true profession (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996; Carnegie Forum, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986). Although standards-based reform efforts are not uniform across the states and vary in terms of the integration of P-12 standards into teacher standards, the overall direction is clear; students, teachers and teacher education programs are being held accountable to ensure that learning occurs in classrooms.

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future is taking a leading role in this initiative. Specifically, in its report, *What*

Matters Most (1996), the Commission stated: "We propose an audacious goal . . . by the year 2006, America will provide all students in the country with what should be their educational birthright: access to competent, caring, and qualified teachers" (p. 21).

Implementing Standards at the State Level

In Indiana, significant change in the preparation, licensure, and induction of educators began in 1992, with the creation of the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB). The 19-member Board is comprised primarily of practicing educators, who represent P-12 administrators and teacher preparation institutions. Additionally, the state superintendent of public instruction serves on the Board. The members are appointed by the governor for four-year terms. The Board is responsible for approving preparation programs, issuing initial and continuing licenses for teachers, administrators, and school services personnel and monitoring the state-wide beginning teacher internship program. Making the Board responsible for these three critical areas ensures that educators are directly involved in developing and enforcing the standards that teachers must meet.

Specifically, how do the teacher standards fit together and how do they relate to P-12 standards? Again, using Indiana's work as an example, developmental level and content area standards have been developed. Teacher education programs must be able to demonstrate preservice teachers' abilities to meet the new standards. Because Indiana is a member of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), their core standards were used as a base for the new Indiana standards. The new content and developmental standards were created by advisory groups composed of P-12 and higher education experts in the various content and developmental areas chosen from a state-wide application process. The Indiana Association of Colleges of Teacher Education was an active participant in the process. Each standards advisory group was charged with defining the knowledge, dispositions and performances that education professionals need to demonstrate responsibly when they enter the profession. In addition, the advisory groups' charge specifically stated that the new standards were to be linked to Indiana's P-12 student standards. The work groups relied on the INTASC standards as well as quality guidelines from professional organizations. As an example, the proposed Indiana Standards for Teachers of Early Childhood are consistent with the guidelines from the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI), and the National Association of Early Childhood Teacher Educators (NAECTE).

In addition to the standards advisory groups which were making recommendations to the Board regarding standards, the IPSB formed a teacher education work group which included P-12 and higher education representatives and the IPSB's director of teacher education. This group recommended that Indiana continue to require teacher preparation institutions to be accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) or to satisfy all standards for NCATE accreditation. In addition, the committee recommended, and the Board approved, requirements that teacher preparation programs: provide evidence that they have incorporated the new Indiana standards within the conceptual framework of the their programs; and provide evidence that they have adopted a coherent, sequential student assessment system guided by the institution's conceptual framework. As part of Indiana's partnership with NCATE, institutions will be required to provide an assessment plan and ongoing assessment evidence as part of their Joint Data Collection System Annual Report (AACTE/NCATE, n.d.).

Implementation Standards in Teacher Preparation Programs

The new standards-based assessment requirements are making a significant impact on teacher preparation programs. Programs are in the process of revising curricula and assessments to reflect the standards. In other words, faculty members must agree on products and performances that will provide evidence of preservice teachers' learning and teaching activities. These may include video analysis of real teaching situations, lesson plans with written rationales and reflections, and samples of student work over time. Collectively, each preservice teacher's products and performances must encompass all of the program standards. Each standard should not require a separate product or performance; many performances will embody multiple standards which indicate efficient teaching and learning.

Teacher education programs are currently—or soon will be—developing assessment criteria, scoring guides, and exemplars for the performance-based assessments. Reliability and validity are key considerations in the assessments. These are particularly challenging issues when developing criteria for high-stakes decisions, including program completion and initial licensing recommendations. According to Harris and Carr (1996), it is important that programs consider the following when developing assessments:

- Criteria should be clear and specifically linked to standards.
- Scales should be provided with clear distinctions between levels.

- Performance descriptions should be specific, observable, and documented.
- Exemplars of student work that illustrate levels of attainment should be provided.
- Evidence of consistent judgments over time and across students is critical.

The assessments will provide data for decisions about the preservice teachers' program completion and recommendations for initial licensure. Teacher education programs should involve practicing teachers in the development of assessments as well as in the evaluation of the preservice teachers as they proceed through the assessment process.

It is important to note that as a whole, the activities, products, performances, criteria, performance descriptions, and exemplars will be sources of evidence that programs will use to document progress and attainment of the standards leading to continued accreditation. The implications of all standards- and performance-based licensing are significant. Teacher education programs can no longer assume that the traditional approach of exposing preservice teachers to theoretical and practical knowledge adequately prepares them to use that knowledge and skill in the classroom to promote learning for all students.

Implementing Standards with Beginning Teachers

INTASC, which was created in 1987 as a program of the Council of Chief State School Officers, is engaged in a multistate effort to create model licensing standards for teachers. Currently, 10 states including Indiana are participating in this project, called the Performance Assessment Development Project. The project's goals include developing performance-based assessments for licensing beginning teachers and developing a trained cadre of mentors and support providers for beginning teachers. The assessment is modeled on the portfolio developed for National Board certification but tailored to expectations for beginning teacher performance.

The IPSB's teacher induction work group has targeted 2000 to actually begin the new assessments with beginning mathematics teachers. English/Language Arts is to go "on line" the following year, followed by science. By the end of the second year of teaching, beginning teachers in Indiana will have to pass the new performance-based assessments. Although they currently are assigned a mentor teacher, with the new system the mentor's role will change. Mentors will be trained to understand the new standards and assessments and will

provide assistance and support to the beginning teacher using standards in the ongoing development of the portfolio. It is important to note that practicing teachers, administrators, and higher education faculty will be involved in scoring the portfolio assessments. Again, the connections with P-12 schools are explicit since teachers are involved in the scoring process itself.

As an example, using a portfolio format, one assessment in mathematics (Ambach, 1996) asked teachers to provide the following documentation of their practice:

- a commentary that sets the context for instruction;
- plans that describe tasks, discourse, environment, and analysis of teaching and learning across a series of lessons, as well as plans for each of the individual lessons in the series;
- a more detailed description of two lessons, including expanded lesson plans, videotapes of the lessons, student work, and commentary;
- a formal assessment of student learning across several lessons, including student commentary;
- a commentary in which the teacher reflects on his or her teaching as documented by the assessment, evaluates the work, and identifies areas for professional development; and
- any additional information the teacher believes represents his or her work as a teacher.

The implementation of performance-based assessments for licensure at the completion of the second year of teaching will have far-reaching effects. Obviously, while beginning teachers are given support, they must also provide documentation about their ability to meet standards with their students. There should be a "ripple effect" as the experienced mentor teachers are trained to apply new knowledge about standards and assessments in order to support the beginning teachers. Second, teacher preparation institutions will be held accountable for the performance of their graduates in real classroom settings. The connections to preparation are obvious; preservice teachers must be prepared to meet the standards and understand performance assessments.

The Impact of Standards on Professional Development

As has been noted, connections to P-12 professional development are embedded throughout the Indiana model. In addition, the Indiana Alliance for National Board Certification, a consortium of five university and P-12 partnerships, is working collaboratively with the IPSB and other stakeholder groups to increase the number of Board-

certified teachers in the state. The alliance members are working to examine how professional development at the P-12 level can align with Board standards and how universities can restructure their graduate curriculum as they interpret what the standards suggest about the knowledge, dispositions, and performances experienced teachers should possess.

A Standards Based University and P-12 Program

One example of how these changes are affecting teacher education programs is a partnership formed in 1995 between the Metropolitan School District of Decatur Township and the University of Indianapolis. The partnership was formed with the intention of nurturing a positive environment for the identification and sustaining of best educational practices, the professional development of inservice teachers and the university teacher education faculty, and the preparation and induction of preservice teachers. The program provides for on-site methods courses, ongoing collaboratively planned on-site professional development aligned with local and state standards, and membership in the Indiana Alliance for National Board Certification.

Interviews (Breault, 1997) with teachers included statements about student learning such as the following: "I think this has made the kids more aware of what's assessed. And it made it easier for me to assess things." and the comment, "My students who would say, 'How many sentences does it have to be?' are now filling up maybe a page—which is good for them."

The model of professional development in the project was intended to increase the effectiveness of the teachers as well as nurture a more positive attitude toward professional development in general. Professional development activities were on-site and developed around district and state student standards. There was a deliberate emphasis on alignment between standards, instruction, and assessment. Teacher comments (Breault, 1997) included:

> How wonderful it has been for me to have the opportunity to grow as a professional once again.
>
> I thought it was really beneficial to teach the classes in our building—to see where we're at. And all of the teachers who are in our building, we were taking it together. I think that means a lot more than one person from one district, one person from another . . . so you don't have a lot of situations that are similar.
>
> It does make it harder because I have to have a sample for my kids . . . they actually watch me do it and then they

> can see what it's going to look like . . . So, in a way, it's put a lot more of the work in the kids' laps, where it is supposed to be, I guess!
>
> We have support from top to bottom. That cannot be said enough . . . our principal was right there in class with us. Our administrators have less time than we do and they are doing this with us.

A pilot group of preservice teachers in the project completed a standards-based portfolio as part of the research study. These portfolios will be used by the university to inform overall assessment development (e.g., creating rubrics, benchmarks).

Preservice teacher comments about the program and their portfolios were very revealing:

> . . . at this point at the middle school level is when a lot of the kids decide whether or not they're going to continue their education, . . . so it was important to me to have them involved in what was happening, or why it was happening.
>
> I am definitely going to do some research on autism to try to understand ____'s needs. (Breault, 1997)

There is strong evidence to discredit the myth that little connection exists between P-12 standards and teacher preparation, licensure, and certification. A famous children's book, Stuart Little (White, 1945), underscores another important consideration. In the book, Stuart, a substitute teacher, asks the students, "How do you know what's important?"

The involvement of P-12 teachers and administrators, university faculty, and policy makers in the questioning and debating of issues surrounding standards to determine what's important may serve as important of a role in the process as having all of the answers.

References

AACTE and NCATE. (n.d.) Joint Data Collection System. [Annual Report]. Washingon, DC: Author.

Ambach, G. (1996). Standards for teachers: Potential for improving practice. *Phi Delta Kappan, 78*(3), 207-210.

Breault, R. (1997). *The impact of three educate Indiana subgrants in MSD of Decatur Township.* Indianapolis, IN: Indiana Department of Education.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, Task Force on Teaching as a Profession.

Harris, D. E. & Carr, J. F. (1996). *How to use standards in the classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Author.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Author.

White, E. B. (1945). *Stuart Little*. New York: Harper & Row.

MYTH 3

Teacher Education Programs Are All the Same

Mary E. Diez

Of all the myths about teacher education, the belief that all teacher preparation programs are the same is one of the most pernicious. First, when it is used by the press, as it recently was in responses that were critical of the report, *What Matters Most*, (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996), it is part of a larger attack focused on damning all institutions that prepare teachers. The attack argues that not only are *all* teacher preparation programs the same, but they all are ineffective. Unfortunately, it's not only the press who promote this view. Teacher educators themselves give credence to it when they assert, as Gary Fenstermacher did as president of AACTE (Fenstermacher, 1992), that after three years in the classroom, one can see no differences in teachers who were prepared at various institutions of higher education.

The myth is pernicious as well because it suggests that, with all institutions equally ineffective, there is little hope for improvement in teacher education. It's a short distance from that position to proposals that teacher education is not really necessary—because all you really need is to know your subject.

But the myth is pernicious for two other, more subtle, reasons. First, when one tries to respond to it by pointing out the differences between and among programs, the temptation is to denigrate one's colleagues by contrasting their (less than strong) programs with one's own (strong) program. The methods of contrast are built on various grounds. In states with standardized test scores, the comparison may be on average scores on the NTE or PRAXIS. Others may compare rates of employment of graduates, but those depend upon local demand as well as the quality of the graduates. Yet others may point to follow-up surveys of teacher graduates and surveys of employers.

The fact is, we have no "standard" way to compare the results of teacher education programs—a situation which reinforces the myth that all teacher preparation programs are the same. I would argue that, even if we did have a "standard" way to compare teacher education programs, the purpose for doing so is questionable. A more important question, of course, is how to work for the improvement of all programs so that students are assured of competent, caring teachers in every classroom.

Second, a corollary of the myth, i.e., that all teacher education programs should be the same, seems to have guided much of the rhetoric in the teacher education reform movement in the past 10 years. Much of this rhetoric is focused on structural elements of teacher education, for example the debates about five or six years of preparation instead of four, liberal arts preparation separated from rather than concurrent with professional preparation, and the use of the professional development school as the only model for collaboration between teacher education and K-12 schools. Such proposals ignore the differences among those people going into teaching as well as the approaches to teacher education as practiced in different kinds of institutions. At this same time, in spite of the growing strength of the standards movement which places the focus on performance outcomes rather than structural inputs, the documents of reform efforts—from the Holmes Group (1986, 1990, 1995) to the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996)—seem to promote this corollary. In contrast, a standards-based approach would allow a variety of structures, as long as all candidates met the standards at the point of licensure.

Faculty members at Alverno, an undergraduate teacher preparation program in an undergraduate liberal arts college, have grappled with both the original myth and its corollary. We have resisted participating in studies that compare our program with other programs and we support studies that help us see how well we are doing against standards—much the same way that we don't compare our students to each other, but look at their performance in relationship to criteria that they must meet to qualify for an Alverno College degree. However, because of the pervasiveness of the myth that all teacher education programs are, and should be the same, we take seriously the responsibility to set forth what we do and to look critically at our students' performance in the program and our graduates' work in schools after graduation.

The Alverno College faculty revised the baccalaureate degree in 1973, to focus on what students need to demonstrate that they can do with what they know (Alverno College Faculty, 1992). We identified

eight abilities (communication, analysis, problem solving, valuing in decision-making, social interaction, global perspective-taking, effective citizenship, and aesthetic responsiveness) as comprising the general education requirements for the degree, and then worked to develop performance assessment processes to validate student demonstration of the abilities within their courses and in external settings (Alverno College Faculty, 1994). Because assessment provides extensive documentation of the quality of student performances, part of the overall design implemented in 1973 was the elimination of letter grades.

Initially, we received comments from our colleagues in other institutions that revealed their assumption of the corollary to this myth, questions such as: "Why don't you do things the way other higher education institutions do?" and "How do you know that what you're doing works?" Specifically for teacher education, as a part of the undergraduate program, additional questions were raised by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction and the NCATE Board of Examiners teams in the late 1970s and early 1980s. On the basis of the demonstrated rigor of our program, we received the only waiver of the grade-point average requirement given by the state; this waiver has also been honored by NCATE.

The college has engaged in considerable research on the ability-based program in the 25 years since we began the program. Our Office of Research and Evaluation (ORE) conducted a longitudinal study on the impact of the curriculum on our graduates, one of few such studies in the history of U.S. education (Mentkowski, in press). In addition, working with the Council for Student Assessment, ORE has conducted validation studies of assessment instruments and assisted in the program evaluation of various disciplinary and professional programs, including teacher education (Rickards and Diez, 1992). Central to those program evaluation studies is the examination of student and graduate performance in relationship to the programs' advanced outcomes.

In order to tell our story and to give information about Alverno as an example of an alternative to "one structure fits all," faculty from teacher education have published a number of articles about our program. In these articles, we outline the process we used to develop our five advanced outcomes in teacher education (Diez, 1990) and describe the evolution of an assessment plan for the teacher education program (Diez, Rickards, & Lake, 1994). We have used our experience to argue that performance-based teacher education needs to be part of a coherent process of teacher development (Diez & Hass,

1997) and to clarify how performance assessment impacts the development of our teacher education candidates (Diez et al., 1998).

Like the other discipline and professional majors at Alverno, we produced a departmental description (Alverno Teacher Education Faculty, 1996) that outlines our conceptual framework, the design of the curriculum, and the experience of faculty and students in our program. Of particular usefulness is a section showing the interconnections between the college's eight abilities, teacher education's five advanced outcomes, the goals for a specific course, and the criteria used in an assessment within that course.

Most recently, we participated in a study of seven successful teacher education programs conducted by the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST), completed in 1997. Researcher Kenneth Zeichner, professor from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, spent several days on our campus, interviewing students, faculty, cooperating teachers, and principals who have hired our graduates. He reviewed documents, visited classes, and spent a day with a fourth-year teacher graduate of the program and shorter visits with three other graduates. Among the findings that we were most pleased about was that teachers and principals do recognize distinctive characteristics of Alverno graduates three and more years into their professional practice (Zeichner, 2000).

I know from experience on the NCATE Board of Examiners that many programs report high satisfaction from their graduates on surveys conducted by the program itself, and our own annual surveys have been routinely positive. So, it was helpful to have the NCREST team develop an externally conducted survey of graduates (of one to four years from completion of the program). According to Zeichner's interpretation of the survey results, our "graduates feel that they have been prepared to be the kind of reflective, learner-centered and learning-centered teachers that the Alverno faculty say they want to prepare"—93.5 percent of the Alverno graduates felt that they were well or very well prepared to teach the knowledge and skills of their disciplines; 92.3 percent said that their program prepared them very well or well to evaluate the effects of their actions and to modify their plans accordingly; and 83.9 percent felt well or very well prepared to use technology in the classroom (Zeichner, 2000).

Similar strong results were provided by the survey of the employers. On the questions related to the implementation of a learning- and learner-centered approach to teaching, such as how well has the teacher education program prepared the teacher to understand how different students in his or her classroom are learning, 82.2 percent of the employers felt that the program had prepared stu-

dents well or very well. In addition, a focus group interview with seven Milwaukee Public School principals confirmed the positive picture of the survey. Zeichner (2000) reported that:

> . . . the Milwaukee principals made it clear that they felt many graduates from other institutions are able to develop some of the skills of teaching and reflecting about teaching after a while that Alverno graduates come into the system with from the beginning. They feel that the rigor of the Alverno program with the constant demand to demonstrate competence through performance, and the repeated practice associated with this performance-based assessment is responsible for the relatively high skill level and ability to self-reflect brought to teaching by Alverno graduates.

What comes through in the focus groups and in the overall NCREST study is that Alverno teacher education graduates are seen by principals and teacher colleagues as better prepared than other beginning teachers. We would be very happy if that were not so—provided it meant that teachers coming out of other programs were as ready for working with children and young persons as our graduates.

Indeed, the reason that both the myth and its corollary are so pernicious is that we can so easily lose sight of the moral responsibility we hold as teacher educators. Our goal should not be to "one-up" the competition, nor to force one model on all programs. Our goal should be to make sure that every teacher we graduate is ready to work effectively to nurture learning in diverse students. Our process of ongoing documentation and reflection, has been both a way to keep that goal in front of us and to guide our ongoing evaluation of what we're doing and its impact on our students and graduates.

References

Alverno College Faculty. (1992). *Liberal learning at Alverno College* (5th rev. ed.). Milwaukee, WI: Alverno College Institute.

Alverno College Faculty. (1994). *Student assessment-as-learning at Alverno College* (3rd rev. ed.). Milwaukee, WI: Alverno College Institute.

Alverno College Faculty. (1996). *Ability-based learning program: Teacher education.* Milwaukee, WI: Alverno College Institute.

Diez, M. E. (1990). A thrust from within: Reconceptualizing teacher education at Alverno College. *Peabody Journal of Education, 65*(2), 4-18.

Diez, M. E. & Hass, J. M. (1997). No more piecemeal reform: Using performance-based approaches to rethink teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education, 19*(2), 17-26.

Diez, M. E., Hass, J. M., Henn-Reinke, K., Stoffels, J. A., & Truchan, L. C. (1998). Guiding coherence: Performance-based teacher education at Alverno College. In Diez, M. (Ed.), *Changing the Practice of Teacher Education: Standards and Assessment as a Lever for Change* (pp. 41-50). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Diez, M. E., Rickards, W. H., & Lake, K. (1994). Performance assessment in teacher education at Alverno College. In Warren, T. (Ed.), *Promising practices: Teacher education in liberal arts colleges.* (pp. 9-18). New York: University Press of America.

Fenstermacher, G. (1992, February). *Where are we going? Who will lead us there?* Presidential address at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, San Antonio, Texas.

Holmes Group. (1995). *Tomorrow's schools of education.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

Mentkowski, M. & Associates. (in press). *Learning that lasts: Integrating learning, development and performance in college and beyond.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future.* New York: Author.

Rickards, W. & Diez, M. (1992, April). Integrating multiple internal and external data sources in the institutional evaluation of teacher education. In M. Woodward (Chair), *Research and evaluation in graduate and professional education.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Zeichner, K. (2000). Ability-based teacher education: Elementary teacher education at Alverno College. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Studies of Excellence in Teacher Education: Preparation in the Undergraduate Years.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

MYTH 4

Teacher Education Is Not Reality Based

Raphael O. Nystrand

The invitation for me to participate in this book came almost exactly at the time that Public Agenda (1997) published a rather scathing indictment about how out of touch schools and colleges of education are with what's going on in the world. It prompted me to react. So, I decided to address the myth that teacher education is not reality based, that it ignores the concerns of teachers and the general public. At the time, Lee Shulman, president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, was quoted in the press about the Public Agenda story, and made a very important point. He said that in some respects our job is to be at odds with teachers and the public over matters of educational policy and practice and what's going on in the schools. It's the role of a "loving critic" and we are in a good position to play that role. I agree, but I don't think the Public Agenda charge can be dismissed as readily as to say, "we are just doing our job folks; get used to it."

The criticism that we are out of touch comes from many sources. One, of course, is the traditional perspective that "teaching is telling" and all one needs to know in order to be an effective teacher is the subject matter. It's not hard to find folks on most campuses who share that point of view; but that's not the group I'm really concerned about. The group I'm most concerned about is the people who graduate from our programs and the people we work with in the schools. I care about their perspective on whether or not what we are doing is based in reality. To come back to Shulman's comments, it's entirely appropriate that we be loving critics and that in working with schools, we criticize what we think is inappropriate. However, we can do this best from a basis of understanding developed by spending time in the schools.

I believe the way to counter this myth is to take our programs to the schools. At the University of Louisville (U of L) we work with a network of 10 professional development schools (PDSs) in four different school districts. Seven are in Jefferson County, a metropolitan school district with more than 110,000 students. The other three are in the adjacent suburban and rural counties. We work with a primary school in two of those counties and a middle school in another.

Our basic preparation program is a postbaccalaureate, professional year program leading to a Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) degree. Our primary and middle school programs are taught primarily in the PDSs. The programs begin at the beginning of the district's school year with students placed in a PDS with a mentor teacher and a broader support group of teachers. Students are in the school full time, with the exception of periods of a week or two when they come to campus full time to reflect on what they are doing and to engage in more didactic classroom activities. Faculty members are assigned to each of the PDSs and work with the students in the schools. They also work with the teachers in the schools, not only in teaching our students but also addressing school-based concerns of importance to them.

Our secondary teacher preparation program is very similar. It is structured a little differently, but the students and faculty members in this program also spend most of their time in the schools. Because our programs are based so heavily in the schools, it is often difficult to find many of our faculty members in our building on short notice. That is a consequence that accompanies this type of commitment. Our goal is to produce the very best teachers we can, and we believe we can do this best by working closely with people who are in the schools on a daily basis. They, in turn, involve our faculty and students in activities that matter to them and provide important teaching opportunities. Here are a few examples:

Service-Learning

We are committed to preparing teachers who will support and advocate for youth and their families. One of U of L's teacher preparation program requirements is that everyone participate in a service-learning project of benefit to the schools. The Family Resource/Youth Center is one such project site for fulfilling this requirement, there are 33 youth center's located in area schools. We also have cooperative relationships with many other community-service agencies. Our students also have participated in activities such as planning a health fair for families and accompanying students on overnight camping trips.

Action Research

U of L students are required to participate in an action-research project with a teacher or someone else in the schools. Some past project topics include: the impact of block scheduling on student achievement; the development of a resource file on authentic assessments; and a study of the characteristics of innovative urban schools. Others include the study of classroom learning styles; the creation of strategies that encourage effective portfolio revision, and the development of classroom management strategies. At the end of the school year, faculty members in the primary-school program host an open house in which their students or graduates make presentations about the projects they have been working on in their respective schools. Their mentor teachers and other faculty members from these schools are invited to participate along with our faculty creating a "giant poster session" that has been very well received.

Small Grants Program

For the last 15 years, we have had a joint small grants program in cooperation with the Jefferson County Public Schools. We have given away more than a half a million dollars. Fifty percent of the funds were received from the school district and the other 50 percent were from the University. The projects have been initiated and directed cooperatively by a representative from the University and from the school district. The University person is not always from the school of education; often these projects are co-directed by a faculty member from arts and sciences, engineering, medicine, or some other discipline. Some examples of recent projects include providing accompanist training workshops for students in the youth performing arts school, offering research and health profession awareness sessions for fourth grade students taught by a medical school professor, and designing a multimedia compact disc to enhance the instruction of practical-living skills in an elementary school.

In the process of carrying out these projects, we have established relationships that focus the reality base from which our faculty and staff approach issues of public education. The payoff, first and foremost, is that it helps us do a better job of preparing professionals. This view is reinforced by the feedback we receive from teachers and administrators—they are pleased to tell us how well they like our graduates; school faculties are eager for their buildings to be designated as PDSs; and we regularly receive requests from schools who want to become participants in our program.

Finally, as a result of these efforts, we have broadened our base for dealing with other important constituents. Former Speaker of the House of Representatives Tip O'Neill said, "all politics are local" and at U of L we often act upon this premise. The way to begin work on a political agenda or public information campaign is by building a strong local base of support. This has been an important byproduct of our field-based teacher preparation programs. Two years ago when it came time for our regular continuing visit from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), we noted the new requirement to solicit public testimony. Several teachers, administrators, and others submitted very positive letters about the reality base of our program.

When the Public Agenda report appeared, the editor of our local paper called me and asked for comments because he was writing an editorial about the report. A few paragraphs from his column (Hawpe, 1997) follow:

> Today's education professors are supposed to be out of touch . . . The proposed conservative remedy includes more discipline in the classroom, which is equated with teaching the same things that were taught in 1955 in the same way.
>
> A recent study by the non-partisan research group Public Agenda gives encouragement to those who argue that teacher training programs are 'out of sync' with the public in these matters and out of sync with the classroom veterans who know what it's really like on the fifth grade firing line.
>
> . . . . [The U of L] approach, Nystrand told me, 'is to emphasize discipline as one aspect of school life, in real settings as opposed to the more traditional practice of teaching about it in a campus-based course.'
>
> U of L students at one PDS helped revise the school's teacher handbook, including its disciplinary policies. They also implement these policies, as part of their experience in the schools.
>
> So much for the complaint of Public Agenda executive director Deborah Wadsworth, who warns against an idealized version of what teaching should be. She said students

> who are preparing to be teachers 'need at least to consider the views of those who are experiencing public education on a daily basis. . . .'
>
> They do that by design, day-by-day, in U of L's school-based program.

As you might imagine, it was a pleasure for me to get up and read that on the front page of the opinion section of the Sunday morning newspaper.

My point is that the myth that teacher education programs are not reality based now is taken by some as fact. However, I believe that by working hard on this issue at the local level—by making sure that our programs are reality based—we can dispel this myth *and* produce better graduates. I also believe that in doing this we can build a constituency who will understand our efforts and be very helpful to us. The way to influence policy makers is from the inside out. We must start with the people to whom we are the closest. If we can persuade the professionals with whom we work, in particular, that we are doing what they need, then they in turn will make their views known to others. Together, we can build support for our efforts with the general public and the elected representatives.

References

Farkas, S. & Johnson, J. (with Duffett, A.). (1997). *Different drummers: How teachers of teachers view public education.* New York: Public Agenda.

Hawpe, D. (1997, November 2). At U of L: Teaching life-long learners. *The Courier-Journal.* Louisville, KY: Author.

MYTH 5

We Have "Lost" the Best and Brightest in Teacher Education

Frank B. Murray

As dean of education at the University of Delaware between 1979 and 1995, I heard from national and local critics each who yearned for the time[1] when the nation's best and brightest were employed as teachers. There were an exceptional number of these critics in the years before *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) report when the deterioration of the public schools, defined almost exclusively by declines in national SAT scores, was attributed to the low quality of teachers and those who were preparing to be teachers.

When newspapers, like *The New York Times* ("Disputes Embarrass Dallas's Educators," 1978), revealed, for example, that more than half the new teachers hired by the Dallas School District, the country's eighth largest school district, had failed a competency test that had been designed for 13 year olds, deans of education around the country had to explain how we had fallen into such a state and what we were going to do about it.[2]

While these critics often displayed a romantic nostalgia and a protective amnesia about a time that could not—and did not—ever exist, their criticisms could not be ignored. The myth of the "lost best and brightest" confuses current reform efforts and undermines the work of schools of education. Regrettably, there never was a time when large numbers of the nation's best and brightest worked in schools. The belief that they did interjects a kind of hopelessness into the debate about the quality of education schools—namely, that they will never amount to much until they enroll the nation's top students in teacher education programs.

The problem for today's deans of education, confronted by commentators with the same nostalgic amnesia, is marshalling arguments

and facts that put the academic qualifications of today's teacher education students in a realistic context that allows the reform efforts to prosper.

More problematic than newspaper stories about cities like Dallas were the stubborn and undeniable facts of the precipitous decline of national SAT scores and of the poor performance of prospective teachers on every standardized measure of academic promise or achievement (e.g., SAT and Graduate Record Examinations or GRE). No one could show that the critics were absolutely wrong in their concern, because their concerns had merit. One could *hope* to show, however, that the matter was vastly more complicated than their romantic views, less worrisome than they thought, and that promising reforms were underway.

I sought to do this in three ways: by finding helpful data in rebuttal of the claim that the nation's weakest students seek to be teachers; by reframing the question; and by inventing new metrics to place the academic qualifications in a different perspective. Lastly, I occasionally was lucky when the critic's nostalgia and amnesia was coupled with myopia.

Using Data to Debunk Claims

When the College Board released data that showed national SAT scores dropped six percent between 1963 and 1982, or about 90 points (55 verbal and 35 math), few realized this was a drop of only 11 items on the test (seven verbal and four math) or that about half that drop was directly attributable to an expanding population of new test takers and college aspirants, which, by itself, might have been seen as good news. The reasons for the remaining portion of the decline have not ever been satisfactorily explained, despite systematic inquiry (see Austin & Garber, 1982). In 1985, the College Board released data for 1973 to 1985 about the discrepancy each year between college-bound seniors and those among them, about six percent, who wished to be teachers. The discrepancies were large, about the magnitude of the entire SAT decline that had galvanized the nation into thinking there was an educational crisis (College Board, 1985).

The distinction between those test takers who merely *hoped to teach* and those who were subsequently accepted and *enrolled* in a teacher education program was lost in nearly all reports of the College Board's results, which left the impression that the nation's future teachers had the lowest scores of any group on the SAT. In Delaware, a highly placed and respected visiting dignitary who was unaware of the distinction, attempted to claim that the teacher education students were the country's weakest college students. His dam-

aging point was blunted effectively when the distinction was clarified, although he asserted his claims had gone unchallenged in more prestigious forums. In most cases, simply pointing out that the College Board data was not about those who were actually enrolled in teacher education programs was sufficient to deflect the critics.

Figures which depicted the gap between aspiring teachers scores and college seniors scores, however, were in wide circulation and led at least one speaker at an Education Commission of the States meeting to claim the national decline of prospective teachers' SAT scores was the cause of the decline among national test takers. In this instance, it was effective to simply point out that causes precede their effects and that the declines the College Board reported were simultaneous and varying declines. Even if the decline for prospective teachers had preceded the other by a few years, the number of afflicted new teachers was such a small proportion of the whole national teaching force, some three million teachers, and the number of years in which they could have done their harmful work was so small that their impact, no matter how strong, could not have caused such a pervasive decline among the nation's 43 million students. The decline in fact occurred everywhere in the system—public and private, rural and urban, large and small, and so forth. If the decline had been attributable to these few new teachers it would have been an amazing finding in its own right since teacher's affects on pupil achievement are otherwise more modest—when they can be found at all.

The larger point is that it is wise to take the critic's claim at face value, so to speak, and then imagine what kind of mechanism could have brought it about. Often the weakness in the claim is transparent when it is taken seriously, because it doesn't fit coherently with other known facts.

When AACTE subsequently produced the Research about Teacher Education (RATE) report series, we learned that the SAT scores of prospective teachers who were actually enrolled in a representative sample of member institutions in AACTE were those of the typical university student, not significantly higher or lower than the typical student's SAT scores (AACTE, 1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990). These findings, coupled with the actual College Board findings, were an effective combination in the rebuttal of those who claimed that teacher education students were from the bottom rung of the college population.

There is some risk in relying on national data and secondary sources, particularly if your critics are tenacious and thorough. Once when I employed the RATE data in the service of my argument, the lieutenant governor of Delaware and a physicist, who was running

for a U.S. Senate seat, pursued the RATE database and found the methodology wanting, thereby undercutting my position. There is no substitute in cases like this for having acquired and mastered the data about one's own institution as, apart from its other values, it is an effective way to make a case when the national data is not supportive or what you had hoped.

At the University of Delaware, for example, the RATE findings held perfectly well. Our teacher education students had average SAT scores, our college's mean scores were ranked in the middle of the nine undergraduate divisions at the university, and our students' grades, while higher than average, were fortunately the same for courses taken in and outside the college of education. Researchers elsewhere also found no significant differences in grade point averages between teacher education students and non-teacher education students (see Howey & Zimpher, 1996).

Reframing the Question

The question of why there aren't more of the nation's best and brightest preparing to be teachers can be productively turned into the question of how many we should be preparing to be teachers, given that some portions of the best and brightest also are needed for other professions and positions.[3]

There does need to be some arithmetical realism about this question because the sheer magnitude of the universal schooling enterprise carries with it the necessity that the schools—at all levels—will be operated by large numbers of relatively less-talented persons. There simply are not enough persons of working age in the country to fill the three million teaching positions and do the other complicated work of the nation. In 1980, for example, if the entire top 20 percent of college graduates, regardless of major, had taken the available teaching positions in the country, there would have been only 30,000 (16%) left to do the other new work of the nation (Lanier & Little, 1986). Of necessity, the nation has designed K-16 educational systems within which persons from the lower levels of the talent distribution can perform with tolerable levels of success.[4]

I found it effective to simply ask critics what the percentage should be. If they thought that about 10 percent of the nation's most able students would be about right, or they could be guided to that number, they were surprised to find that was about the number of the best and the brightest currently enrolled in teacher education. Vance and Schlechty (1982) found, in fact, that 11 percent of the top 20 percent of SAT test takers were enrolled in teacher education in 1976-79, low demand years when there was an abundance of teachers. The

question remains: on what basis should the percentage be higher as a matter of public policy, given that reasonable portions of the nation's top students must be allocated to the other professions and occupations?[5]

Inventing New Metrics

The data from teacher education graduates' performance on the Graduate Record Examinations (GRE) are not appreciably different from the SAT results (Lanier & Little, 1986). At the University of Delaware, this meant that our graduate students in education, unlike our undergraduate students, were at the bottom of the distribution. Much was made of this within the university. When we examined the differences between the mean GRE scores on the test in education of our students and those of national test takers, however, we found our students had significantly higher scores than the norm in education. When we computed these same differences for every other graduate program at the university, we found the differences were not as large as ours. In some often otherwise strong fields, the differences in fact went the other way, they were not drawing the best and brightest available in their pools while we were. This statistic provided a better talking point to use within the university since it placed us near the top.

The Role of Luck

Occasionally, we were seen as better than we really were. Perhaps because of a lack of moral fiber or because I felt we deserved a break, I let some of these misconceptions pass without comment. When, for example, our local press called me about the performance of our graduates on the recently mandated competency test Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST) for the teaching license, I did not volunteer that the PPST scale score only ran from 150-190, nor did I challenge the assertion that our students' mean scores (above 170) were impressive as 170+/190 had to be pretty good in anyone's book.[6]

A Final Word on the Best and the Brightest in Teacher Education

While there are effective ways to counter the popular misconceptions about the proportion of the nation's best and brightest in teacher education, the overall picture of the talent pool of future teachers is not bright. The public, quite understandably, will want to know what steps education schools are taking to improve teacher education. Our college's membership and leadership in several national reform groups like AACTE, the Holmes Group (recently, Holmes Partnership), and the Project 30 Alliance, were effective not only in an-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

swering our critics, but also in solving the genuine problems our critics had uncovered. It was always helpful to be able to place our own work in a national context and, in effect, validate our work in that way.

Finally, problems like our national obsession with the test scores of our students, particularly test scores that have very little to do with final success in our programs are problems, like the poor who are always with us. We don't solve these problems, we simply forget about them and move on to others.

Postscript 1999

By 1995 when I had left the deanship, most states, thinking they had solved the teacher quality problem with modest testing programs for new teachers, had moved beyond teacher testing to the difficult task of aligning their state achievement tests with their newly enacted curriculum content standards. In April 1998, however, the myth of the lost best and brightest jumped back into national consciousness and became an issue once more for deans of education. The reason for the reincarnated myth was the fact that nearly 60 percent of those who took a new teacher test in Massachusetts failed it. The reason it could not be ignored this time was that the Congress responded to the Massachusetts problem by requiring all ed schools to report the pass rates of their graduates on the state tests.

It is a fair question to ask if the strategies I used between 1979 and 1995 would work in the 1999 debates. Luck has run out on the cut-score "dodge," although its pass rate corollary lingers. The spring 1999 report of The Education Trust (Mitchell & Barth, 1999) unmasked the dodge with its finding and report that the content of the common teacher tests is only at the high school level and that the passing scores are embarrassingly modest (e.g., fewer than half the items correct in some states). The myth of the lost best and brightest, as a result, became a new claim that they would not have been good enough anyway.

The effort to debunk the reincarnation of the myth with data is aided by two new sources that also became available in 1999 (Gitomer, et al., 1999; Bruschi & Coley, 1999). Gitomer, et al. (1999), with data from 300,000 prospective teachers (1977-95), confirmed that teacher education students were, by and large, the typical college student we had thought they were all along (those preparing to teach academic subjects had scores equal or higher than those of the college population, while those in elementary education were below the college population averages). Data from the National Adult Literacy Survey (Bruschi & Coley, 1999) also showed that teachers were on a par with

college-educated adults, and fortunately exceeded the population as a whole, on standard measures of literacy. Thus, deans and others can now effectively challenge the myth of teachers being the lowest scorers in higher education.

The undeniable fact that teachers are not over represented among the high scorers endures, of course, but it should be put, as before, in the larger policy context of how the nation should allocate and reward its most talented persons. While The Education Trust properly points out some unresolved issues with the content of todayís tests, deans should raise forcefully the documented problems of the reliability and validity of today's teacher tests (see, for example, Haney, et al., 1999).

The need for the invention of revealing and creative metrics is greater now than it was. The Title II (section 211) provisions of the latest Higher Education Act require, under penalty, ed schools and states to report the passing rates of their graduates and new teachers, respectively, on the stateís test. Deans need to vigilantly scrutinize the metrics that will be used in these reports because they are likely to underestimate the performance of their students. They will do this because, as currently proposed, they report only part of the data. Only those graduates who teach in the state and only those new teachers who were educated in the state will be counted. Typically, standards are higher for out-of-state students. Should these students return home to teach, they will not be counted among the institution's graduates—even though they were. The proposed metrics, in other words, are likely to miss the accomplishments of the most able students.

The metrics may be misleading in other ways—they will count all teacher education graduates who take the state's test, not just those the ed school recommends for the teaching license, and they will fail to count those prospective teachers enrolled in non-education majors. The state and institutional reporting is self-report and loosely monitored. Ed schools, to take another example, could require the tests prior to graduation and thereby ensure 100 percent pass rates. In those cases, we wouldn't know anything about the quality of the program from this proposed measure of program quality. In the end, policy makers and the public would have a selective and misleading picture of the scores of graduates and the scores of the state's new teacher workforce.

More problematic for education school deans is another 1999 report, this one from the Fordham Foundation because it argues, often with data, that all the assigned guarantors of teaching quality (ed schools, accreditors, standards boards, licensure agencies) have failed. The evidence of their alleged failure is the low performance on the

teacher tests, which is no higher, sometimes even lower, than the performance of those without an education degree, a license, a certificate, accreditation, and so on. This places a great and illegitimate burden on these tests, beyond what they were designed to carry, but it also means that deans of education, and their colleagues, need to develop other metrics and uncover convincing evidence of their worth if the Fordham points are to be rebutted effectively.

Setting aside the known psychometric irregularities of the Massachusetts test, it is still regrettable that the scores were so poor. It was even more regrettable and unfortunate, however, that the Massachusetts deans were not able to bring forth quickly other evidence of their graduate's competence. Surely, this other evidence, especially from the leading ed schools across the country, will show us that a fitting proportion of the nation's best and brightest have not been lost in the rising generation of teachers.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1987). *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures.* Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 292774)

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1988). *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures.* RATE II. Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 304410)

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1990). *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures.* RATE III. Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 324295)

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1991). *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures.* RATE IV. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1992). *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures.* RATE V. Washington, DC: Author.

Austin, G. & Garber, H. (1982). *The rise and fall of national test scores.* New York: Academic Press.

Bruschi, B. & Coley, R. (1999). *How teachers compare: The prose, document, and quantitative skills of America's teachers.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

College Board Admissions Testing Program. (1985). National report on college-bound seniors. New York: Author.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Ball, D. (1997). Teaching for high standards: What policymakers need to know and be able to do. New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Disputes embarrass Dallas's educators: Low teacher scores disclosed. (1978, July 23). *The New York Times,* p. A21.

Fordham Foundation. (1999). *Better teachers, better schools*. Washington, DC: The Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.

Gitomer, D., Latham, A., & Ziomek, R. (1999). *The academic quality of prospective teachers: The impact of admissions and licensure testing*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Haney, W., Fowler, C., Wheelock, A., Bebell, D., & Malec, N. (1999). Less truth than error? An independent study of the Massachusetts teacher tests. *Education Policy Analysis Archive* [On-line]. Available: www.olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/v7n4.

Howey, K. & Zimpher, N. (1996). Patterns in prospective teachers: Guides for designing preservice programs. In F. Murray (Ed.), *The teacher educator's handbook: Building a knowledge base for the preparation of teachers* (pp. 465-505). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lanier, J. & Little, J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 527-569). New York: Macmillian.

Mitchell, R. & Barth, P. (1999, Spring). How teacher licensing tests fall short. *Thinking K-16, 3*(1). Washington, DC: The Education Trust.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1993, April). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vance, V. S. & Schlechty, P. C. (1982). The distribution of academic ability in the teaching force: Policy implications. *Phi Delta Kappan, 64*(1), 2-27.

Endnotes

1. In response to a question of how we would know when the nation was no longer at risk, I had two governors, neither from Delaware, tell me that the educational crisis would end when SAT scores returned to their highest levels.

2. An affiliation with the Holmes Group, and other national reform organizations, was one effective strategy for dealing with this and other related questions about the quality of the nation's teacher education programs, but that's another story.

3. The most generous estimates of the proportion of variance in student test scores that can be explained by the teacher's qualifications is 40 percent (Darling-Hammond & Ball, 1997).

4. The design has extensive professional support personnel for teachers, as many as one person outside the classroom for each person in it. It also has a fairly narrow view of teaching as keeping order, telling the truth publicly about relatively simple matters, and awarding grades to students.

5. This issue is with the large percentage of students from the bottom 20 percent who are enrolled in teacher education (Lanier & Little, 1986). Teaching seems to attract more than its share of academically untalented persons, about 40 percent of the bottom 20 percent (Lanier & Little, 1986). About 30 percent of this group become teachers while only seven percent of the top group actually take teaching positions (Lanier & Little, 1986). Of course, neither the SAT, nor any other standardized test, is a proven predictor of teaching success.

6. The fact that education students tend to earn high grades in their courses (Howey & Zimpher, 1996) creates another problem for deans and the ed school's reputation. One explanation is that the discipline of education is quite accessible and easy to understand, especially once its jargon is decoded. Another is that ed school faculty, by the nature of their profession are superb teachers. Unfortunately, there is little independent evidence to support this view. The common view is that grade inflation is more widespread in ed schools than elsewhere.

MYTH 6

Schools and Colleges of Education Are Unable to Raise Funds

Bernard Oliver

Over the last few years, fund-raising in higher education has grown tremendously. As we approach the 21st century, major gifts and fund-raising have contributed significantly to the incredulous attainment of billion dollar endowments by several universities (e.g., Harvard, Emory University, Stanford, Yale, Princeton) Accompanying these billion endowment club members are several public universities as well (e.g., University of Texas, University of California, University of Michigan, Texas A&M)

What this trend suggests is that the various academic constituencies of the institution have become major players in the quest for the elusive campaign dollars, despite what well publicized reports of successful fund-raising campaigns have stated. Clearly the role of fund-raising has shaped and enhanced institutional priorities and programs. Furthermore, the responsibilities of deans in the fund-raising process have significantly altered their roles and job expectations. For many, the time commitment has elevated to as much as 30 to 40 percent of the job depending on the stage of the fund-raising campaign.

Since aggressive fund-raising is relatively new to most schools and colleges of education, various myths and perceptions exist about raising revenue. What follows are some of the myths I discovered about fund-raising during a major capital campaign at Washington State University.

The Context

Washington State is a land-grant institution over 100 years old with a history of alumni giving. It has the highest alumni giving rate of all public institution—55 percent. The vision of this institution for

the 21st century focused on the following ideas: access, great teaching, a special student experience, research to benefit society, the marketing theme of "Making a Difference for Washington State," and an emerging athletic program in all aspects.

Fundraising Myth One: Schools and Colleges of Education Aren't Significant Players in Major Campaign Efforts

When I went to WSU eight years ago, they were in the silent phase of the campaign—planning and establishing campaign communities for the various units. WSU has centralized/decentralized development offices and was highly successful at the institution level. However, the campus perception was that our school wasn't going to be a major "player" in the capital campaign because we didn't have the "horses" and we had a history of being the "problem" child of the institution (i.e., an unproductive faculty, not connected to public schools or agencies, reputation for having a fractured faculty, Christian right, Gay/Lesbian, racist faculty, incompetent, etc.) and in the words of the consultant of a major firm, "the college had no advocates in central administration."

So, what did we do? First, we developed a realistic goal for fundraising from $800,000 to 5.3 million dollars. Then, we developed initiatives that focused on and captured the essence of the educational reform movement. There were two underlying themes for our campaign—diversity and educational partnerships. Following this thematic approach, we focused on the following areas: science and mathematics; at-risk learners; leadership development for Washington's schools; international/global education; and literacy education.

The establishment of areas of focus significantly helped us overcome some of the initial negative press. The focus on making differences for kids, families, and schools in the state of Washington led to a major gift from The Boeing Foundation of $1.2 million in the first year of my tenure.

Fundraising Myth Two: Schools and Colleges Aren't Responsive to School Needs

Like *Different Drummers* (Farkas, Johnson, & Duffett, 1997), the perception and the reality of what we were doing to enhance education in the state of Washington in a standards-driven outcomes-performance model were two different things.

To tell our story, we got involved with the Commission on Student Learning, which means, we became visible. The other thing we did was hire an information officer to highlight faculty work by ar-

ranging state-wide tours, radio and television appearances, publications and other media coverage to help us get the word out about our programs. In addition, we formed the group InformED, a national organization for information officers representing schools, colleges, and departments of education to help others do what we did.

Fundraising Myth Three: Major Citizens, CEO's, and Others Don't See Teacher Education as an Area of Focus

As the institution was forming its campaign committee, the talk around campus was who was going to work with the school of education, the group who was considered to not have a "prayer in hell" of meeting its goal of $5.3 million. We were fortunate because we were able to attract several major players to our team including, a leading bank CEO, a regional bank CEO, the Boeing Corporation, and other prominent citizens, as well as endorsements and support from the mayor of Seattle and a major state newspaper. In addition, we were able to provide training on educational issues and policy to our campaign committee to education them about the college and the state of education (Dickey, 1988).

Fundraising Myth Four: Given the Urgent State of Education, Corporations and Individuals Will Rush in to Offer Monetary Assistance

I wish this were the case. Despite a compelling case document and strong commitment to Washington's schools, major donors were still reluctant to give that major gift. We went hat-in-hand to visit major donors over and over again. Overcoming the public perception of schools and colleges of education is not an easy task. We stayed on course with our goals and objectives, but we still had difficulties. You just have to be persistent and keep telling your story, and above all, relate it to improving the quality of education for students, families, and teachers.

Fundraising Myth Five: Educators Don't Have Money to Give

This view permeated our entire development office. Everyone was quick to say that reaching our goal was tough because teachers don't have money.

My strategy was to convince people that the amount wasn't significant—the act of giving was. Consequently, we had a significant individual giving component because of our alumni base. In addition, we developed some very real sample strategies, we:

- developed a formula or statement which stated that for $50 a month your contribution will help WSU students, children in Washington, etc.
- asked staff and faculty to support our programs in an effort to stand behind what we believed in. As a result, over 50 percent of the department faculty and staff contributed, which was ranked as the second highest in the institution.
- visited different groups of alumni, such as older and younger alumnus, to tell our story and ask for help.

We were fairly confident that somewhere out there, an alum who was wealthy would surface and that they would do so in the College of Education, but nobody did. Although we didn't have any major gifts, like a million dollars, we did get a number of minor gifts and planned giving gifts.

My advice on cultivating your department's alumni is to host receptions for them which include dancing, conversation, and dinner. In addition, recognizing and hosting emeritus faculty and getting them involved in major events was also helpful.

Fundraising Myth Six: Faculty Understand the Need for Fundraising and are Active Participants

When I was the University of Texas at Austin, there was a saying: "that dog don't hunt," which means that the possibility of something happening was very slim or doubtful. That sums up my view of faculty on this issue. This is one of these really difficult areas that, quite frankly, I don't know if you can overcome (Farkus, Johnson, & Duffett, 1997). If the money or gift wasn't directly related to their individual interests, then faculty tended to have no interest or concern about fund-raising on a macro level. Furthermore, in my experience, if a major public gift is received, faculty automatically assume that they have direct and immediate access to it. Faculty also perceive that staffing a development office takes away from hiring faculty, teaching assistants, and others. What they fail to realize is that in a major campaign, unit involvement is a "high stakes" investment.

As a result of this perception on the part of faculty, we initiated a number of activities to try to bring faculty in. We:

- developed a bunch of faculty research interests for potential donors (they didn't want to do this so I tied it to budgeting and travel.);
- highlighted faculty in our newsletter and publications;

- communicated with them at faculty meetings and through direct contact; and
- scheduled meetings with our development officer.

Despite these efforts, "That dog don't hunt!" The faculty remained disconnected from the efforts.

Fundraising Myth Seven: Fundraising Takes Time

The prevailing myth is that for deans, fund-raising is a time consuming activity (some say it takes 25 to 30 percent of a dean's time). While this is probably the case, I believe it is a necessary and natural part of our mission. My approach is simple: if you weren't raising funds, what would you be doing with the extra time? You would probably still be focusing on academic priorities such as personnel or organization "stuff" like meetings. In this era of "slam-dunking criticism" of schools and colleges of education, you just have to understand that public relations and marketing efforts are part of the job, whether you are asking for money or not (London, 1997).

Fundraising Myth Eight: Given the Moral Imperativ and Changing Demography, Folks Will Support Diversity

One of the stark realities you have to face in this arena is that this moral imperative doesn't generate the level of support one would think it would. As Cornell West (1994) says, "race matters."

Although diversity was a university priority, insignificant effort was devoted to this arena. We did get some support in our college, because basically this was something I would throw myself on the sword for.

Our outreach and diversity efforts were highly successful and significantly enhanced our minority recruitment efforts. Our minority student enrollments went from under 10 to over 100 in four years. Our minority faculty numbers went from two to 11 in three to four years. These efforts weren't without backlash, but like I said, these are "throw yourself on the sword" issues.

So, what do you do? We emphasized diversity training, hired minority recruits, established outreach activities for students to provide emotional contact, and developed a teaching fellows program. Although central administration used these examples in their rhetoric, little support or attention on this issue came from the development side.

Fundraising Myth Nine: Fundraising Drives Academic Programs

There is a perception or myth that development efforts drive academic programs and faculty roles and expectations. This is not true. Sure, schools and colleges have image problems, but to my knowledge I don't know of *any* school or college that changed their "work" because of a major gift. Let's face it, we are our own worst enemies.

We shape the fund-raising efforts and these efforts are mission program enhancement opportunities. They represent ways for us to improve, and in many cases, address a serious societal and university need. However, we spent considerable time communicating to faculty about the fact that programs aren't driven by money but by the public agenda. These reports and editorials that denounce are trade for its various inadequacies were not part of the faculty understanding of fund-raising and this lack of understanding sometimes created unnecessary barriers.

Conclusion

Despite these compelling odds, schools and colleges of education have been extremely successful in the fund-raising game (i.e., University of Southern California, University of Connecticut, University of Missouri-St. Louis, etc.). The recent national attention given to education (see, for example, the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future) and the condition of K-12 education in this country have prompted considerable philanthropy interest from individuals and corporations. After over a decade of "deaning," I am convinced we have only scratched the tip of the iceberg. If we (schools and colleges of education) can continue to be more responsive to schools, families, and communities, particularly in urban areas, successful fund-raising and giving will significantly increase over the next decade. We will finally be able to say, "that dog *does* hunt!"

References

Dickey, M. (1998, May). Building a better board. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy, 10*(8), pp. 33-35.

Farkas, S. & Johnson, J. (1996). *Given the circumstances: Teachers talk about public education today*. New York: Public Agenda.

Farkas, S. & Johnson, J. (with Duffett, A.). (1997). *Different drummers: How teachers of teachers view public education*. New York: Public Agenda.

London, B. (Ed.). (1997). *The role of information officers in schools of education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teachers Education.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Author.

Washington State University. (1993). *Campaign WSU: Making a difference for Washington State*. Pullman, WA: Author.

Washington State University. (1994). *Collegé of education: Campaign WSU*. Pullman, WA: Author.

Washington State University. (1995). *Washington State University: Benefiting the people of the state, nation and the world*. Pullman, WA: Author.

Washington State University. (1997). *Campaign WSU: Final report*. Pullman, WA: Author.

Washington State University. (Winter, 1997-98). *Campaign Communique*. Pullman, WA: Author.

West, C. (1994). *Race matters*. New York: Vintage Books.

MYTH 7

Outsiders Are Not Welcome

Gary Galluzzo

We educators have managed to cloister ourselves into a world we've made more inaccessible to the general public than it should be. We did this unknowingly, naively, and strangely enough, with the best of intentions in mind. It happened as we've tried to transform teaching from an occupation into a profession. Over the years, and along the way, we necessarily developed a language that would facilitate our conversations toward advancing the profession. That language is what some call jargon, and what the cynics of our field call, "educationese." Undeterred, though, we continue to proliferate a lexicon that undoubtedly advances our thinking and our scholarship, but does little to build a relationship of trust with people who see what we do, i.e., teaching, as rather simple. Our remoteness, in my estimation, has allowed a general public, many of whom did not enjoy their own years in school, to create myths about teaching, learning, and schooling. These myths are powerful conceptions partially based in experience and partially created from suspicion born of distrust.

I look at the distance we've created as a by-product of the decades, and something that all other professions know well. The distance is also the mystique that attracts people to study the field. The difference between teaching and other professions, though, is that most other professions do not develop a familiarity with the practices of the field by having observers watch practitioners for 12 years, which amounts to perhaps 200 teachers. Our students form impressions of teaching through these observations that open their minds to the creation of myths about teachers, teaching, and more generally, the profession. I also look at this distance from our constituents as a breach of trust with the public that supports a free and public

education for all children. Today, it is almost commonplace to hear school leaders, and even university administrators, talking about the importance of the external community. There was a time, not all that long ago, when we could just as easily have heard *in loco parentis*. Conditions have changed.

With a national economy that places education into a competition marketplace that includes private providers of services that only schools once provided, helping people understand our "business" is central to our future. The rise of test-coaching companies, calls for vouchers, annual increases in the number of charter schools, increases in private school enrollments and more children being home schooled, and the possibility of Internet schools forces educators to explain what we do in clear and precise terms. The education consumer has more options, and as we know from our own lives, the more information we can get, the better prepared we are to make sound decisions. Moreover, when that information is clear and understandable our interest in the product or service increases and, as a result, it likely receives our support. I sincerely doubt that many of us could purchase a product from a salesperson who speaks of it in arcane and technical language. Rather, we would search until we found someone who gained our confidence, a person knowledgeable enough about the product to explain it in terms we can understand. It is no different with educators and our external audiences. Confidence and trust are important dimensions of our profession.

While I do not argue that jargon alone is the place from which myths spring, I do claim that clarity of language and providing clear explanations of complex topics in ways people can profit from will re-engage a public that has become accustomed to living on eye- and ear-grabbing headlines and sound bites. This is a tall order, but informing the public should be a natural role for educators.

Public Commentaries

With this view as background, I began to offer weekly commentary on an affiliate of National Public Radio (NPR) in Colorado in 1991. For five anda half years, I offered a five-minute analysis on a topic of education that was in the newspapers, in the state legislature, or generally in the air and of some significance to the general public. An example of the former might be test score declines, and an example of the latter might be something as broad as "school reform"—ideas that were on people's minds, but not necessarily in the news on any given day. These commentaries ran twice every Mon-

day morning during NPR's Morning Edition program. The commentaries were about 600 words, which required both parsimony and pith since the listener does not have a long attention span. Short sentences and meaningful language seemed to work best. Throughout the 270 weekly commentaries, my goal was always to make the strange familiar to people who cared about education and children, and who wanted to know we educators were doing something to ensure a brighter future. That was my definition of challenging a myth: making the strange familiar.

The commentaries proved quite successful. Soon after I started them, the local newspaper picked them up. Some time after that, the University's Office of News and Publications distributed them to newspapers statewide. I think it is probably safe to say that is rare for an educator to write a weekly column "from the inside" with the intent of trying to help "the outsiders" understand us better. Some weeks it worked, and some weeks it did not, but I learned that that goes with the territory.

In the following, I will outline three ways in which I tried to explain education to the general public, all directed toward challenging the myths they might have about a topic they see as remote, yet, important to them. These three commentaries were directed at keeping the myths from proliferating.

Using Research to Challenge a Myth

We have a tendency, probably an artifact of our training, to see research as operating without much concern for the world of practice. We may also have a tendency to see research that is related to the world of practice as tentative knowledge waiting to be challenged by another study. In fact, that is part of the beauty of being "on the inside." We enjoy the puzzle of putting research knowledge together over the span of our careers. Unfortunately, our external constituents treat our field with greater certainty than we do. They think issues are settled, while we are debating them. To illustrate this point, it is said that President Kennedy stated he would have no professors or scholars in his cabinet because they always wanted to conduct one more study, and that the real world of public policy didn't have time for another elegant study. I think we are beset by this phenomenon. We treat research as tentative. We treat it as removed from practice or view it with caution. In both cases, it is the nature of the search for knowledge in science. In the meantime, the myths proliferate.

Myth: Today's students are not as smart as their parents and grandparents.

This statement is almost a commonly accepted truism for the public. The media and other public information sources that shape opinion, such as national reports from government agencies, routinely include a statement about the decline in scores on the SATs as evidence of the claim. In fact, when the College Board recentered the SATs in 1996, the news reports included statements from critics that this change would mask the real decline in scores that is three decades long. The unarguable decline has appeared in so many graphs in so many newspapers that it is generally accepted that today's students do not measure up to previous generations.

For one of my commentaries in 1993, I used a study by Whittington (1992) that essentially answered this question, at least in the area of American history. It came around as a response to Ravitch and Finn's (1993) convincingly utilitarian book on what high school seniors know. As I wrote in my commentary, Whittington, using data from the 1930s, 1940s, 1950s, 1960s, and finally 1987, "found that the percentage of items students in 1987 got right was no different than the percentage of items that people as old as their parents and grandparents got right. These three groups across the ages seemed to know as much American history as did those who preceded them. Stated another way, today's kids know about as many history facts as did their predecessors." In this way, I tried to use an empirical study to challenge a commonly held perception or myth about children today. I did not use expansive professional jargon and repeated my point so that it would be heard. I also did not expect to change anyone's mind, I only tried to open it a little.

Explaining Ourselves to Us

Across these commentaries, I worked on the theme of whether schools are mirrors which reflect societal trends, or places where societal trends begin. This is a commonly analyzed question within the profession. We often ask beginning teachers to think about their role as leaders in society and the potential problems of moving too far ahead of the followers. This particular topic is an example of one of those "in the air" discussions that begins when the local school attempts to insert something in the curriculum which previous generations did not experience in their education. The distrust of educators grows from our best efforts to innovate. Examples of such changes might include: family education, whole-language reading instruction, cooperative learning, outcomes-based education, and many others we all know.

Commentaries on this particular topic of "mirror or leader" took many forms. One commentary that used research to enlighten this debate included a series of statistics about children. These data came from a variety of sources that cross my desk, including special reports, National Center for Education Statistics data, and journal articles. I would compile them for use in some form in the future.

Myth: Schools can solve our social ills and equalize life for all children.

In one particular commentary, I presented the following data:

- Eight million children under age 18 have no health insurance.
- Children without health insurance use fewer medical services than do insured children.
- Sixty-three percent of the U.S. population is covered by health insurance compared to 90 percent of the population in European countries.
- The mortality rate for children under five in the United States is the highest in the world.
- One in five U.S. children develops a learning disability that could have been prevented with good nutrition and antibiotics.

With these and other statistics not included here, I argued that some future school-aged children will come to school capable of learning, but not necessarily at the society's expected rate of one grade level per school year. I argued that our schools, as we currently fund them, cannot achieve the expectation of great equalizer and leader of societal change, let alone the healthy economy goal recently placed on the schools, for the reason that the conditions which prevent healthy children from entering kindergarten increase in number, complexity, and influence annually.

The degree to which these types of statistics sway public opinion is empirical. I doubt I had much influence, but perhaps, and this is just like teaching, armed with a little data, a listener or a reader would do something in the local community to help someone in need. Even that action can effect change in the life of a student.

Celebrating Our Successes

I finish this chapter with one other example of a myth about which I am mildly critical.

Myth: Failing schools lead to a failing national economy.

In contacts with the business community I often hear about how the decline in our economy beginning in the mid-1970s and into the

early 1990s was due to the low standards seemingly endemic to our education system. This is a very delicate topic for many reasons. Perhaps the chief reason is that the height of public criticism about our nation's schools marked by the 1983 publication, *A Nation at Risk*, coincided with the worst inflation ever experienced in this country. These two were linked, and have been ever since, in ways they hadn't been linked before. It is also a delicate topic because of the abstract level of data available on the topic. In the absence of data, myth and persuasion are powerful. Finally, it is delicate because the business community is needed to work with their localities to help create aspiration in the next generation of children. Writing disrespectfully of the business community was never my intention in questioning the validity of this particular myth, but the data do not support the myth that we entered into an economic decline because of the quality of teachers and other educational practices. For almost ten years, this was the mantra, our national economic fortune is tied to the quality of schooling.

However, beginning in 1994, it was almost impossible to ignore the headlines that our sluggish national economy was turning around. In 1998, it is not only impossible to ignore the headlines we receive almost daily in the media, but one is uplifted by reports on how strong the economy is, how comfortable we are, and about how many people are working.

On more than one occasion, I wrote commentaries questioning the relationship between education and the economy. It was hard to argue there was no relationship when considering the issue at the level of the individual. There are many analyses hanging in the offices of high school guidance counselors comparing the income levels of high school drop-outs, high school graduates, college graduates, etc. At the micro level, the data are persuasive. Less education means less money. At the macro, or national and international levels, are the data as good? In a handful of commentaries in the early years, I asked whether teachers should be blamed for the condition of the economy. I would hear from my critics that they should. In later commentaries, when the economy was much improved, I encouraged people to go thank a teacher as we must have achieved successful school reform. I wrote, "the economy is now good, so we must have achieved high quality school reform." I did this to point out the lack of logic in the original attack on our schools.

As I said, my view on this subject may be described as a bit cynical, but the argument is illogical. I also saw educating the public as exposing the inconsistencies in arguments made by public education's

critics for their political advantage. We all know that schools have not turned around as quickly as the economy has, but I hope I also exposed the fallaciousness of the argument. Education and the national economy are not as closely tied together as we are often led to believe.

Closing Thoughts

Since I wrote these commentaries in 1991 to 1997, I have changed institutions and now realize the time and effort it took. I am not using this short piece to encourage weekly commentaries by other educators. However, I do hope to convince educators at all levels to be more public about what we do, about why we do the things we do, and about the ethical questions that surround it all. In my view, the expertise in other professions that serve the public casts a shroud of distrust around them also. They lead to some of the funniest jokes we hear.

Educators are communicators, though, and we should use our well-developed skills as communicators to build bridges between our jargon and our public. I believe these bridges are essential in keeping education free, public, accessible, and worthy of trust.

References

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1993, April). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Ravitch, D. & Finn, C. (1993). *What do our 17-year-olds know?* New York: Harper and Row.

Whittington, D. (1992). What have 17-year-olds known in the past? *American Educational Research Journal, 28,* 759-780.

ABOUT THE EDITORS

Greta Morine-Dershimer is professor emeritus of the Curry School of Education, University of Virginia. She retired from the Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Special Education in 1998, following 10 years at the Curry School and 45 years as a teacher and teacher educator. She is the current editor of the journal *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*. Her primary interests are teacher education reform and research on teaching and teacher education. She served as a member of AACTE's Research and Information Committee from 1995-98 and as chair of the committee.

Gail Huffman-Joley is dean emerita of the School of Education and Professor in the department of Elementary and Early Childhood Education at Indiana State University. She has served as founding chairperson of the Indiana Professional Standards Board and serves on the Board of Directors of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Her primary interests include educational reform, teachers' career continuum, professional development schools, and the teaching and learning of reading and the language arts.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Mary E. Diez is professor of education and dean of the graduate program at Alverno College (WI). She helped pioneer an ability-based curriculum and a performance assessment program at Alverno in the 1970s and is now a nationally recognized expert in standards-based education reform. Diez is a past president of AACTE and a member of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and the NCATE Board of Examiners. In 1995, she was awarded the Harold W. McGraw, Jr. Prize in Education.

Gary R. Galluzzo is dean and professor in the Graduate School of Education at George Mason University (VA). Previously, he was dean of the College of Education at the University of Northern Colorado, faculty at Rowan College (NJ) and Western Kentucky University, and a high school social studies teacher in New York. Galluzzo is on the board of directors of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and has served on the AACTE Board of Directors and the Colorado Teachers and Special Services Professional Standards Board.

Molly Gregg is a staff member of the Truman Pierce Institute at Auburn University. A former middle school teacher, she has completed graduate work at Harvard University and is currently completing her Ed.D. at Auburn University. Her major research interests focus on the deanship, restructuring higher education, and forming collaborative partnerships across institutions and organizations.

Gene E. Hall is dean of the College of Education at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas. From 1988 to 1999, he was professor of educational leadership at the University of Northern Colorado, where he also served as dean of the College of Education from 1988 to 1993. Previously, Hall was a faculty member at the University of Florida and the University of Texas at Austin. Currently, he is the director of the AACTE Partnerships for Excellence in Teacher Education project, which provides technical assistance to institutions in pursuing initial accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Richard C. Kunkel is Wayne T. Smith Distinguished Professor of Educational Leadership and dean of the College of Education at Auburn University, where he has served since 1990. He has been executive director of the Holmes Partnership and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and has served on the board of directors of AACTE. Previous positions also include dean of education at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, chair of the department of education at St. Louis University, and a faculty appointment at Ball State University.

Frank B. Murray is H. Rodney Sharp Professor in the School of Education and Department of Psychology at the University of Delaware and director of the Center for Educational Leadership and Policy. He was dean of the College of Human Resources, Education, and Public Policy from 1979 to 1995. Currently, Murray is president of the Teacher Education Accreditation Council. He has been executive director of the Holmes Partnership and chair of the board of its forerunner, the Holmes Group; served on AACTE's Board of Directors; and was president and co-founder of the Project 30 Alliance, an organization of faculty in education and the liberal arts.

Raphael O. Nystrand was professor and dean of the School of Education at the University of Louisville (KY) from 1978 until his death in 1999. He served as Kentucky's secretary of education and humanities in 1984 and was a past vice president of the Holmes Group. Nystrand also served on the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board and as an AACTE representative to the State Partnership Board of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Bernard Oliver is the Ewing Kauffman/Missouri Endowed Chair in Teacher Education and dean of the School of Education at the University of Missouri-Kansas City. Previously, he was dean at the colleges of education at Washington State University and St. Cloud State University (MN) and taught at Syracuse University and the University of Texas at Austin. He holds leadership positions and is active in AACTE, AERA, the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges/Affiliated Private Universities, and the Holmes Partnership.

E. Lynne Weisenbach is dean of the School of Education at the University of Indianapolis (IN). Previously, she was chair of the Department of Teacher Education at Indiana University, and taught at Ball State University and in several elementary school settings. Weisenbach has served as president of the Indiana Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and in various positions with the Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education, the NCATE State Partnership Board and Board of Examiners, committees of the Indiana Professional Standards Board, and was appointed to the leadership cadre for AACTE's New Deans' Institute.

1307 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-4701
Tel: 202/293-2450 ▲ Fax: 202/457-8095
Web: www.aacte.org

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").